

**REMARKS**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are now present in the application. Claim 5 has been amended. Claim 6 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 10 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-4, 7-10 and 12-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated Caffarelli et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,091,686 (hereinafter "Caffarelli"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

Independent claim 1 recites a combination of steps including "reading information on whether or not a file recorded on the optical disk is prohibited to be renamed" and "determining whether to conduct a requested operation of renaming the file based on the read information".

Independent claim 3 recites a combination of steps including "reading information on whether or not a file recorded on the optical disk is prohibited to be moved" and "determining whether to conduct a requested operation of moving the file based on the read information".

Independent claim 7 recites a combination of steps including “checking whether the requested file operation for an associated file is prohibited or not based on pre-written attribute information for the associated file if the identified command indicates at least one of a file renaming and a file moving”.

Independent claim 10 recites a combination of elements including “each file descriptor has file attribute fields having flags for restricting file renaming and file moving”.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combinations of steps and elements set forth in independent claims 1, 3, 7 and 10 are not disclosed or suggested by the reference relied on by the Examiner.

Caffarelli discloses that a compact disc has an attribute flag 450 indicating whether a file is read only or read/write (see FIG. 10; col. 11, lines 51-52). The Examiner on pages 2-3 of the instant Office Action alleged that marking a file as “read only” would prevent any type of modification including renaming and moving. Applicant respectfully disagree.

As well known in the art, the attribute flag “read only” merely indicates that the *contents* in the file are read only. It does *not prevent the file from being renamed or moved*. For example, one can assign a Word document as a “read only” file and can *still rename the file or move it* to a different directory. “Read only” file only prohibits the users from editing the contents in the document. Accordingly, Caffarelli’s attribute flag “read only” fails to teach the above

combinations of steps and elements as recited in independent claims 1, 3, 7 and 10.

Since Caffarelli fails to teach at least the above features of independent claims 1, 3, 7 and 10, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 3, 7 and 10 and dependent claims 2, 4, 8, 9, and 12-20 (due to their respective dependency from independents claim 1, 3, 7 and 10) clearly define over the teachings of Caffarelli. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 5, 6 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Caffarelli in view of Ikeda et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,636,551 (hereinafter “Ikeda”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner’s rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. While not conceding to the Examiner’s rejection, but merely to expedite prosecution, as the Examiner will note, independent claim 5 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 6. In particular, independent claim 5 has been amended to recite a combination of steps including “the information being written on the

optical disc in a file attribute field of a file identifier descriptor in which detailed information on the file is written". Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of steps as set forth in amended independent claims 5 is not disclosed or suggested by references relied on by the Examiner.

The Examiner has correctly indicated that Caffarelli fails to disclose a copy attribute. With regard to the Examiner's reliance on Ikeda, this reference discloses imposing a particular attribute pattern such as "Never Copy", "Copy Once", "No More Copy" or "Copy free" onto the information signal (*e.g.*, video signal) and writing the information signal imposed by the attribute pattern onto the DVD disc (see FIG. 1). Ikeda also discloses that when reading the DVD disc, the superimposition pattern determination section 274 discriminates which attribute pattern is imposed on the information signal (see FIGs. 4-5; col. 22, lines 44-64). In other words, Ikeda's attribute pattern is imposed on the information signal when writing and is discriminated by the superimposition pattern determination section 274 from the information signal when reading. Ikeda fails to teach that the attribute pattern is "written on the optical disc *in a file attribute field of a file identifier descriptor* in which detailed information on the file is written" as recited in amended independent claim 5.

In the alternative, at least for the same reason, Ikeda also fails to teach "the file attribute fields further include a flag for restricting file copying" as recited in dependent claim 11.

Accordingly, neither Caffarelli nor Ikeda individually or in combination teaches or suggests at least the above features of independent claim 5 and dependent claim 11. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5 and 11 clearly define over the teachings of Caffarelli and Ikeda. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

#### **Additional Cited References**

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but rather to merely show the state of the art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

#### **CONCLUSION**

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) respectfully petition(s) for a three (3) months extension of time for filing a reply in

connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$1,020.00 is attached hereto.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By Esther Chong  
Esther H. Chong  
Reg. No. 40,953

EHC/GH/jg

*GH*

P. O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000